



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,363	12/21/2001	Fabio Casati	10013644	4968
7590	03/20/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			BOYCE, ANDRE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/032,363	CASATI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andre Boyce	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Drawings

2. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 7, 10-16, and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 7, 16, and 23 recite the limitation "said user" in line 3 of the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 10 is rendered vague and indefinite. The claim recites “said processor for executing a method for performing.” This language seems to indicate intended use, therefore it is unclear whether the processor actually performs the steps. Claims 11-16 are rejected based upon the same rationale, since they depend therefrom.

Claim 17 is rendered vague and indefinite. The claim recites “causing a computer system to perform an method performing.” This language seems to indicate intended use, therefore it is unclear whether the computer system actually performs the steps. Claims 18-23 are rejected based upon the same rationale, since they depend therefrom.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 16-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Casati et al (eFlow: a Platform for Developing and Managing Composite e-Services, April 2000).

As per claim 1, Casati et al disclose method for performing a context-dependent service comprising (i.e., service provider selects and invokes proper composite service, based up context of customer request, ¶ 8): executing a composite service (i.e., composite e-services, ¶ 5); accessing context information (i.e., customer data, including

name, current address, and destination address, ¶ 9); and automatically incorporating said context information with said composite service (i.e., eMove collects data and notifies the change of address to all parties that have relations to the customer, ¶ 9).

As per claim 2, Casati et al disclose a node definitions repository; process definitions repository; and process execution data (i.e., eFlow provides a repository of processes, nodes, and data type definitions, ¶ 28).

As per claim 3, Casati et al disclose said composite service is an electronically available e-service (i.e., composite e-services, ¶ 5).

As per claim 4, Casati et al disclose said context information is related to a user (i.e., customer data, including name, current address, and destination address, ¶ 9).

As per claim 5, Casati et al disclose said context information is maintained in a context repository (i.e., data type repository, to allow the reuse of the same data type across different service nodes and processes, ¶ 32).

As per claim 7, Casati et al disclose said context information is automatically incorporated with said composite service without requiring action by said user (i.e., most eMove services require general information related to a customer and may be reused directly from the data repository, ¶ 32).

As per claim 8, Casati et al does not explicitly disclose said context dependent service includes a (c)ontext-node (i.e., data collection node, ¶ 29)

Claims 10-14 and 16 are rejected based upon the rejections of claims 1-5 and 7, respectively, since they are the computer system claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claims 17-21 and 23 are rejected based upon the rejections of claims 1-5 and 7, respectively, since they are the computer usable medium claims corresponding to the method claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 6, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casati et al (eFlow: a Platform for Developing and Managing Composite e-Services, April 2000), in view of Stewart et al (US 2002/0161688).

As per claim 6, Casati et al does not explicitly disclose said context repository is maintained and updated by: a semantic context broker; an application monitor; a device monitor; and an environment monitor. Stewart et al disclose a unified modeling language (i.e., semantic context broker) used to populate repositories with activity diagrams, state charts, and workflow models, wherein the repositories are read at run-time by various components (i.e., an application monitor; a device monitor; and an environment monitor), including off-the-shelf configuration/revision tools (¶ 0315). Both Casati et al and Stewart et al are concerned with effective workflow management, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include context repository is maintained and

updated by: a semantic context broker; an application monitor; a device monitor; and an environment monitor in Casati et al, as seen in Stewart et al, as an efficient means of updating the repository via a method that can take advantage of off-the-shelf management tools (see Stewart et al, ¶ 0315), making the Casati et al system more robust and flexible.

Claim 15 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 6, since it is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim.

Claims 22 is rejected based upon the rejection of claim 6, since it is the computer usable medium claim corresponding to the method claim.

9. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Casati et al (eFlow: a Platform for Developing and Managing Composite e-Services, April 2000), in view of Ramanathan et al (USPN 6,182,136).

As per claim 9, Casati et al does not explicitly disclose said c-node is executed by selecting a process execution time node to be invoked, based on context information. Ramanathan et al disclose defining nodes of various types and indicating their associated dependencies among the nodes (column 8, lines 5-11). Both Casati et al and Ramanathan et al disclose services and service elements that are cooperative in execution of a core service, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include defining nodes of various types and indicating their associated dependencies in Casati et al, as seen in

Ramanathan et al, as an effective means of determining when a node is to be executed, making Casati et al more robust.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

-Leymann et al (USPN 6976257) disclose managing workload within a workflow management system.

-Sprogis (US 2004/0093608) discloses a digital network system.

-MacLean et al (USPN 6505219) disclose a process management system to describe the flow of work.

-Swartz et al (USPN 6236994) disclose management of information within an enterprise.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre Boyce whose telephone number is (571) 272-6726. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

adb
March 14, 2006

o b
ANDRE BOYCE
PATENT EXAMINER
A. U. 3623